

1 DAVID H. KRAMER, State Bar No. 168452  
COLLEEN BAL, State Bar no. 167637  
2 LISA A. DAVIS, State Bar No. 179854  
BART E. VOLKMER, State Bar No. 223732  
3 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
Professional Corporation  
4 650 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050  
5 Telephone: (650) 493-9300  
Facsimile: (650) 565-5100  
6 [DKramer@wsgr.com](mailto:DKramer@wsgr.com)

7 JONATHAN M. JACOBSON  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
8 Professional Corporation  
12 East 49th Street, 30th Floor  
9 New York, NY 10017-8203  
Telephone: (212) 999-5800  
10 Facsimile: (212) 999-5899  
[JJacobson@wsgr.com](mailto:JJacobson@wsgr.com)

11 Attorneys for Defendant  
12 Google Inc.

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
15 SAN JOSE DIVISION  
16

17 KINDERSTART.COM, LLC, a California  
18 limited liability company, on behalf of itself and  
all others similarly situated,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 GOOGLE INC., a Delaware corporation,  
22 Defendant.  
23  
24  
25

CASE NO.: C 06-2057 JF (RS)

**DEFENDANT GOOGLE INC.'S  
OPPOSITION TO KINDERSTART'S  
MISCELLANEOUS  
ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST  
UNDER L.R. 7-11 TO EXCEED  
PAGE LENGTH OF MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION  
FILED MAY 26, 2006**

**OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF**

Pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-11(b), defendant Google Inc. (“Google”) hereby submits this opposition to plaintiff KinderStart.com LLC’s (“KinderStart”) Motion for Administrative Relief to Exceed Page Length of Motion for Preliminary Injunction Filed May 26, 2006 (Doc. No. 19). Google opposes KinderStart’s request for three reasons.

First, the request is untimely. If KinderStart wished to file a brief in excess of the page limit required by Civil L.R. 7-2(b), it should have secured such relief *before* filing a brief in contravention of the Local Rules. Indeed, plaintiff’s counsel acknowledges that KinderStart planned to file its preliminary injunction motion as early as May 2, 2006. Google should not be put to the burden of responding to an oversized brief solely on KinderStart’s whim.

Second, the request is procedurally improper. Civil L.R. 7-11(a) requires a Motion for Administrative Relief to be accompanied “by either a stipulation under Civil L.R. 7-12 or by a declaration that explains why a stipulation could not be obtained.” KinderStart’s motion is not supported by a stipulation or a declaration.

Third, the request is substantively flawed. KinderStart has not made a showing that a departure from the Local Rules is necessary to support its preliminary injunction motion which rests on allegations that Google, a private actor, has violated KinderStart’s First Amendment rights. Google’s previously filed Motion to Dismiss addressed this First Amendment claim in less than five pages, and dealt with all nine of KinderStart’s claims for relief within the 25-page limit of Civil L.R. 7-2(b).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Contrary to KinderStart’s assertion, Google’s Motion to Dismiss did not exceed the 25 page limit of Civil L.R. 7-2(b) because tables preceding the motion are not included when calculating the length of a motion.

1 For these reasons, Google respectfully requests that the Court deny KinderStart's Motion  
2 for Administrative Relief to exceed the applicable page limit and strike KinderStart's oversized  
3 brief.

4 Dated: June 2, 2006

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
Professional Corporation

6 By: /s/ David H. Kramer  
David H. Kramer

8 Attorneys for Defendant  
Google Inc.